

11-3-1971

CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 11/03/1971

Esther Johnston

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes>

Recommended Citation

Johnston, Esther, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 11/03/1971" (1971). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 436.
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/436>

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the CWU Faculty Senate Archive at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact pingfu@cwu.edu.

MINUTES: Regular Senate Meeting, 3 November 71
Presiding Officer: E. Gordon Leavitt, Chairman
Recording Secretary: Esther Johnston

ROLL CALL

Senators Present: All senators or their alternates were present except Joel Address, Glen Clark, and Robert Jones.

Others Present: Kenneth Hammond, William Eberly, Dale Comstock, Ken Harsha, and Beverly Heckart.

AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL

The chairman announced the following additions to the Agenda:

1. Under Communications, add Memorandum from Louise Tobin; and information on the Regional Conference on Negotiations in Higher Education sponsored by the National Education Association and hosted by Washington Association for Higher Education to be held in Cheney on November 5-6.
2. Under Reports, add report from Ken Hammond on the Advisory Committee to the Council on Higher Education.
3. Under New Business, add report and discussion on the joint meeting of the Council of Faculty Representatives with the Council of Presidents and Interinstitutional Representatives.

The chairman asked if there were any further changes. There being none, the Agenda with changes was approved.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of October 6 were approved with the following changes:

In the third line of the last paragraph on page 6, Graduate Council should be changed to read Undergraduate Council.

Mr. Lawrence requested an addition to the minutes on page 10, immediately following the quotation of Handbook policy on department chairmen:

"In response to an inquiry by Dean Green about the terminus a quo for present department chairmen's terms of office, it was decided that incumbent chairmen would serve four years from the date of their last regular election of appointment."

Mr. Lawrence felt that this decision should be in the record, for reference in the near future.

COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were received:

1. A letter from Charles McGehee, dated October 22, requests on behalf of the Sociology Department, that the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee examine and make recommendations about how to resolve this year the selection of an acting chairman for the department. Dr. Harrington's presentation to the Board of Trustees of the Administration's recommendation that the department of Sociology's choice for the one year acting chairmanship position be approved has never been acted upon. The chairman will send a charge to the Senate Personnel Committee to consider this matter.
2. A letter from John Shrader, dated October 13, requesting the Senate Curriculum Committee to develop policy by November 15 regarding Field Experience and Intern type courses. The chairman announced that the Senate Curriculum Committee has been charged to consider this matter.
3. A letter from Edward J. Harrington, dated October 6, regarding the request that the members of the Counseling and Testing Services be given rank and faculty benefits including the right to be considered for tenure. The chairman announced this letter will be considered at the next Executive Committee meeting.
4. A memorandum from Al Lewis, Parliamentarian, dated October 27, regarding confusion over "accepting" and "receiving a report." The chairman requested the Senators to follow the procedures outlined in this memorandum.
5. A memorandum from Louise Tobin, dated October 28, requesting clarification of Faculty Code regarding voting privileges. The Personnel Committee will be given a charge to discuss this letter with Louise Tobin and return with their recommendations.
7. Information pamphlet on the AHE/NEA Conference and Workshop to be held in Cheney on November 5 and 6. The chairman announced that anyone interested in attending should contact Robert Carlson, Ken Harsha, Jerry Jones or Max Zwanziger as they will be attending.

REPORTS

- A. Executive Committee--Miss Putnam announced that an attempt has been made to expand the Executive Committee minutes so the report of the Executive Committee at the Senate meetings will not duplicate items covered in the minutes. Clarification may be requested by Senators on any matters contained in those minutes. Miss Putnam gave the following report
 1. Ethnic Studies Program--Alex Kuo, the new director of the Ethnic Studies Program and Bernard Martin were invited to meet with the

Executive Committee to provide an opportunity to meet Mr. Kuo and to become familiar with some of the background of the creation of such a program. Discussion included clarification and interpretation of the Director's responsibilities. Mr. Kuo informed the Executive Committee that he is in the process of writing a proposal for an Ethnic Studies Program. He advised the committee that curriculum matters in the program would go through the normal curricular channels.

2. Senate Curriculum Committee--Chairman of the Senate Curriculum Committee, Gerald Reed, met with the Executive Committee to discuss the policy making responsibilities of his committee. He was reminded of the Code's statement that the "Senate Curriculum Committee shall be concerned with the study, development, and improvement of curriculum and educational policy in the College." Three policy items have recently been directed to this committee for their recommendations. They include (1) the issue of the 90 hour transfer limitation from Community colleges; (2) consideration of guidelines for field and intern type courses; and (3) the matter of correlation of course contact hours to the number of credits given. The Executive Committee affirms the importance of a faculty member's prerogative and freedom in determining method and content in his class; however, they are equally aware of the need for policy and/or guidelines which take into consideration the total college curriculum and program.
 3. Committee Assignments--It is the view of the Executive Committee that because of the many necessary changes and conflicts that arise in helping to make appointments to College Committees, that a better procedure is needed for setting up committees next year. The Executive Committee would like suggestions offered.
- B. Budget Committee--No report at this meeting.
- C. Code Committee--Mr. Ringe reported that the Code revision is being prepared and should be out soon and be received by the Senate members in the near future.

Mr. McGehee asked about the progress of the Academic Fairness proposal and said that in regard to any rewriting of the proposal he would like to know if the two committees could work together on it. The chairman asked Mr. Ringe to consult the Student Affairs Committee when they work on the Academic Fairness proposal.

The Senate Chairman commented on the progress of the Code. It is being typed and he expects to distribute it to the faculty this week. The first hearing may be held with members of the Board of Trustees on November 12. He said the Board of Trustees want to meet with the Senate on the hearing procedure outlined in the Code revision. Mr. Leavitt asked that suggested changes in the Code be presented in written form.

- D. Curriculum Committee--Mr. Reed said the Curriculum Committee met on October 28. At that time they passed on the curriculum proposals. He said the Curriculum Committee has a meeting scheduled next week with Mr. Schliesman regarding the 90 hour transfer limitation from Community Colleges and with Mr. Shrader regarding Field and Intern courses.

MOTION NO. 789: Mr. Reed moved, seconded by Mr. Sparks, that the Faculty Senate approve the curriculum changes on pages 195, 196, and 197. The motion was passed with a unanimous voice vote with Ken Berry abstaining.

- E. Personnel Committee--No report at this meeting.

- F. Student Affairs Committee--No report at this meeting.

- G. Special report from Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Need for a Faculty Code of Conduct. Mr. Lawrence, chairman of the committee, asked if there were any questions regarding the committee's report. The committee, after considering possible external or internal pressure, concluded that there is "no need for a Code of Conduct--but does not thereby admit to or condone irresponsibility or license on the part of the faculty. It should be clearly recognized that faculty conduct is in fact already governed by a strong sense of self-discipline, apparent in both the history of and current situation at this college, and by existing policies and procedures." (Copies of the full report available in the Senate office).

MOTION NO. 790: Kent Richards moved, seconded by Chester Keller, that the Senate accept the report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Need for a Faculty Code of Conduct.

After some discussion, Mr. Berry called for question.

Motion No. 790 was then voted on and passed with a unanimous voice vote.

- H. Kenneth Hammond gave a report on the Advisory Council to the Council on Higher Education. Mr. Hammond was chosen to serve on the Council from a list of candidates selected by last year's Faculty Senate. There are 11 faculty, 9 students and 5 administrators representing every private and four-year institution. Mr. Hammond then discussed the meeting he attended last week of the Advisory Committee and said he came away from the meeting feeling much better than he expected. He said the Council is studying Sabbatical Leaves and he needs to come up with case studies of Sabbatical Leaves. Sometime this year there will be someone from the Council of Higher Education on campus to study tenure. Mr. Purcell asked who is doing the study. Mr. Hammond said Mr. Chance is doing it. Another study being done is that of contact hours. On contact hours, the kinds of information requested on the form provided made it impossible for faculty to honestly evaluate his time. Mr. Hammond also commented on requirements regarding resident students. The Council's plan for planning is to be done by 1975. It will be done in stages and will have task forces.

Mr. McGehee said with respect to the faculty assignment analysis, he needs information to show that four two-hour studies are no more work than one eight-hour. Mr. Purcell said there is a way to do it. He wants to have the Department Chairmen invite him to their department meetings because he wants to talk to them about load studies. He said he will talk to the departments on how to put together a formula.

The chairman informed the Senate that Mark Henning, chairman of IPAC, is a student representative on the Advisory Council.

OLD BUSINESS

No Old Business.

NEW BUSINESS

The joint meeting of the Council of Faculty Representatives with the Council of Presidents and other interinstitutional representatives in Seattle on November 2 was discussed. The Senate chairman, Mr. Harsha, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Hammond reported on the meeting and answered questions regarding the salary recommendations. Mr. Jones, our representative to the subcommittee of the CFR that drew up the salary package, reported on the supporting data collected and said that the material would be reproduced and sent to the faculty. In their recommendations the CFR request for the 1972-73 academic year:

1. For state universities--20-25% above the 1971-72 level;
2. For state colleges--15-20% above the 1971-72 level.

They further request for the 1973 regular session of the legislature for all state universities and colleges an additional 20% plus an amount equal to the increase in the cost of living. An additional request was made for increased supplement to retirement.

Mr. Harrington reported on the Council of President's decision to write a Preamble. This Preamble was received by phone this morning and the full report will come by mail. Mr. Leavitt then read the Preamble to the Senate. The Preamble asks for a 10% increase in faculty salaries and 7% for staff. The chairman asked Mr. Harrington what is meant by "average" salaries. Mr. Harrington said straight across the board--just 10% increase. Mr. Harrington brought to the attention of the Senate the statement in the Preamble that states a need for an increase of 20% in the next regular session. Mr. Harrington feels there is a real chance of getting 10% in the special session and working for 20% later.

Mr. Carpenter said he was troubled by the last paragraph of the Preamble which states: "Failure to heed in any way requests from the inter-institutional faculty committee will be certain to lead to loss of confidence in the present system of salary discussion." He thinks it

doesn't serve any purpose to threaten to go to unionization. Mr. Harrington said he agrees with Mr. Carpenter that this statement should be stricken.

The chairman and Central's Council of Faculty Representatives will ask the Board at their meeting on November 12 to support faculty salary increases. Members of the Senate were encouraged to attend the Board of Trustees meetings whenever possible.

The chairman asked Mr. Harrington if he knows what action the Presidents took regarding the retirement recommendations. The recommendation on retirement was tabled by the Presidents for the present time.

MOTION NO. 791: Mr. Alexander moved, seconded by Chester Keller, that the Senate endorse the recommendation of the Council of Faculty Representatives to the Council of Presidents dated October 29 and support any actions toward achieving those goals, including the recommendations in the Preamble document from the Council of Presidents, and further recommend that the Board of Trustees support this request.

After considerable discussion, it was decided that the Senate should not take action but rather wait until the CFR Representatives from other schools are contacted.

MOTION NO. 792: Mr. McGehee moved, seconded by Mr. Reed, to table Motion 791 until next Wednesday at 4 o'clock when a special meeting of the Senate can be called. The motion was voted on and passed with a unanimous voice vote.

MOTION NO. 793: Mr. Keller moved, seconded by Mr. Fisher, that the Senate support our Council of Faculty Representatives in their efforts to deal with salaries between now and the next meeting in order to achieve their goals. The motion was voted on and passed with a unanimous voice vote.

MOTION NO. 794: Mr. Berry moved, seconded by Mr. Carpenter, that the Senate go on record as recognizing the 10% figure indicated in the joint council Preamble as being minimal to offset the cost of living. The motion was voted on and passed with Mr. Harrington abstaining.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
4 p.m., Wednesday, November 3, 1971
Room 123 Hertz Hall

- I. ROLL CALL
- II. AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES, October 6, 1971.
- IV. COMMUNICATIONS
 - 1. Letter from Charles McGehee
 - 2. Letter from John S. Shrader
 - 3. Letter from Edward J. Harrington
 - 4. Memorandum from Albert Lewis, Parliamentarian
- V. REPORTS
 - A. Executive Committee
 - 1. Report by Vice Chairman
 - B. Standing Committees
 - 1. Budget
 - 2. Code
 - 3. Curriculum
 - 4. Personnel
 - 5. Student Affairs
 - C. Committee to Study the Need for a Faculty Code of Conduct
- VI. OLD BUSINESS
- VII. NEW BUSINESS
- VIII. ADJOURNMENT

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF Nov. 3, 1971

ROLL CALL

☒ Alexander, James
☒ Anderson, David
☒ Andress, Joel
☒ Berry, Kenneth
☒ Brooks, James
☒ Carlson, Frank
☒ Carlton, Robert
☒ Carpenter, Jann
☒ Chrismer, John
☒ Clark, Glen
☒ Collins, Frank
☒ Dunning, Bill
☒ Douce', Pearl
☒ Fisher, Lee
☒ Jacobs, Robert
☒ Jakubek, Doris
☒ Johnson, Ron
☒ Jones, Jerry
☒ Jones, Robert
☒ Keller, Chester
☒ Kallienke, Gerhard
☒ Kallioinen, Eino
☒ Ladd, Arthur
☒ Lawrence, Larry
☒ Leavitt, Gordon
☒ McGehee, Charles
☒ Maloney, Jim
☒ Nylander, James
☒ Purcell, John
☒ Putnam, Jean
☒ Reed, Gerald
☒ Reynolds, Roger
☒ Richards, Kent
☒ Ringe, Don
☒ Shadle, Owen
☒ Sparks, Larry
☒ Wise, Don

Marco Bicchieri
Fred Lister
Calvin Willberg
Raymond Wiman
☒ Edward Harrington
☒ Bill Floyd
Frederick Wolfer
Donald Cocheba
Marie Madison
Sheldon Johnson
Robert Benton
Richard Fairbanks
Dorothy Huntoon
Robert Harris
☒ Charles Stastny
Jim Parsley
David Lygre
Charles Vlcek
Jay Bachrach
Rosco Tolman
☒ Bryan Gore
John Vifian
John DeMerchant
William Benson
John Pearson
Everett Irish
James Klahn
Al Lewis
Daniel Ramsdell
Robert Bentley
Gerald Brunner
Max Zwanziger

VISITORS

PLEASE SIGN THIS SHEET

Faculty Senate Meeting

Kenneth L. Hammond
William S. Eberly
Neal R. Constock
Sam D. Janke
Beverly Heckart

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

1100 THE RICE BUILDING

Chairman,
Faculty Senate

RECEIVED
NOV 3 1971
FACULTY SENATE

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON
November 3, 1971

Requested addition to Senate Minutes of
6 October 1971, page 10, immediately following
the quotation of Handbook policy on department
chairmen:

"In response to an inquiry by Dean Green about
the terminus a quo for present department chair-
men's termn of office, it was ruled that
incumbent chairmen would serve four years from
the date of their last regular election or ap-
pointment."

I think that this decision should be in the
record, for reference in the near future.

Respectfully,

Larry I. Lawrence

Larry I. Lawrence

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

Department of Sociology

October 22, 1971

Mr. Gordon Leavitt, President
Faculty Senate
Campus

Dear Gordon:

On July 9, 1971, Dr. Edward Harrington, acting in the capacity of Vice-President for Academic Affairs, presented to the Board of Trustees the Administration's recommendation that the Department of Sociology's choice for a one year appointment for acting chairman be approved. This choice had been worked out in cooperation with the administration to the mutual satisfaction of all parties and in accordance with all applicable policies and procedures of the Faculty Handbook and Faculty Code.

After an extensive executive session, from which the public was excluded, the Trustees took no action on Dr. Harrington's recommendation. They neither approved nor rejected it, nor would they discuss their reasons for this inaction. The result of this has been that the Sociology Department has been without a chairman since the end of the summer quarter. The department was precluded from selecting another candidate from within the department since the remaining members were either ineligible or otherwise not in a position to assume these duties. Time and money prevented bringing in someone from outside the department.

The situation created by the Trustees for the departments and the administration is intolerable; our decisions have been negated for reasons about which we can only speculate. As members of an institution presumably devoted to principles of rationality we are now faced with planning for the future without a rational basis. Secret decision making and reasoning not subject to public scrutiny are antithetical to the goals and very existence of institutions of free and open inquiry.

On behalf of the Sociology Department, I therefore request that the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee undertake a thorough examination of this matter, and make recommendations about how it might be resolved yet this year and be prevented from occurring in the future.

Very truly yours,



Charles L. McGehee
Senator

CLM:DR

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

ELLensburg, WASHINGTON
98926

October 13, 1971

Dr. Gordon Leavett
Chairman
Faculty Senate
102 Edison Hall
Campus

Dear Dr. Leavett:

The ACCC has been faced repeatedly with curriculum decisions for which policies were lacking. Often in the past, by the action of the committee itself, policy has been made. I believe this to be an improper approach to decision making and an improper function of the ACCC. The ACCC is a review and advisory committee.

We are beginning to review Field Experience and Intern type courses and are reluctant to act on these because of the absence of policy. The committee members instructed me to ask the SCC to develop policy within one month (Nov. 15th) regarding such courses.

We need specific answers with respect to the following kinds of questions:

- a. What type of supervision should be expected and offered, including the number and kinds of visits?
- b. What role should any outside agency be expected to provide in terms of supervision, experiences, pay, and/or other costs?
- c. What kinds of responsibility should be expected from the student in terms of reporting, seminars, papers, readings, research, etc.?
- d. What kinds of grading procedures and criteria for these procedures might be used?
- e. What commitments from Staff, Department Chairmen, and Administration must be in evidence with respect to time, staff allocations, department funding, and staff formula?

- f. How should credit be determined? Should such credit be repeatable? Also, should credit for prior experiences be allowed (that is retroactive credit)?
- g. What should be the prerequisites in terms of courses, maturity of students, etc.?

Undoubtedly, there are other questions that should and ought to be raised. Courses of field nature are presently with the ACCC and are being held until curriculum policy from your committee, hopefully, will be prepared. The committee does not wish to inhibit innovations like Field Experiences; in fact, most members are in favor of these kinds of courses. However, guidelines need to be established.

If you believe that this request is not within the province of your committee or you believe policies cannot be forthcoming by November 15th, please let me know so the ACCC can revert to its policy making role.

The committee members collectively or individually, including myself, would be most willing to meet with the SCC regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

John S. Shrader
Chairman
All-College Curriculum Committee

ns

cc: ACCC Members
Dr. D. Schlieffman
Dr. L. Barton
Dr. L. Osborn

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

October 6, 1971

Mr. Gordon Leavitt
Chairman, Faculty Senate
C W S C, Campus

Dear Mr. Leavitt:

Last year Dr. Frank Price was charged with studying the request that the members of the Counseling and Testing Services be given rank and faculty benefits including the right to be considered for tenure. His conclusions were given to me via a memo in late May. It said, "I discussed the problem with you, Bob Miller and his staff, Jack Witherspoon and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Everyone agrees on one thing--something ought to be done!"

With the revision of the Faculty Code about to be considered by the Senate, I feel that now is the time to act. I hereby submit Dr. Price's recommendation for consideration by the Faculty Senate.

Recommend that the professional employees in the Counseling and Testing Services:

- a) be granted the right to rank and tenure
- b) receive all other faculty benefits as provided for members of academic departments
- c) be placed in a category equal in status to the Library.

Your consideration of this matter will be appreciated.

Cordially,

Edward J. Harrington
Vice President for Academic Affairs

jm

cc: Dr. Brooks
Dr. Miller

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate Members

FROM: Albert Lewis, Parliamentarian

DATE: October 27, 1971

RE: Confusion over "accepting" and "receiving a report."

Below are the appropriate passages dealing with "accepting," "adopting," and "receiving" a report (from Robert's Rules of Order Revised, Chicago: Scott Foresman and Company, 1951).

From Page 22.

"Accepting a report is the same as adopting it, and should not be confused with receiving a report, which is allowing it to be presented to the assembly."

From Page 223.

"When the report of a committee has been received, that is, has been presented to the assembly and either read or handed to the chair or the secretary, the next business in order is the disposal of the report, the proper disposition depending upon its nature.

If the report contains only a statement of fact or opinion for the information of the assembly, the reporting member makes no motion for its disposal, as there is no necessity for action on the report. But if any action is taken, the proper motion, which should be made by some one else, is to 'accept the report' which has the effect of endorsing the statement and making the assembly assume responsibility for it."

From Page 224.

"If the report contains recommendations not in the form of motions, they should all be placed at the end of the report, even if they have been given separately before, and the proper motion is to adopt the recommendations.

If the report concludes with a resolution or a series of resolutions, the proper course is for the reporting member to move that the resolution or resolutions be adopted or agreed to. This method should be used whenever practicable."

From Page 229.

"While the motions to adopt, to accept, etc., are often used indiscriminately, and the adoption of any one of them has the effect of endorsing or adopting the opinions, actions, recommendations, or resolutions submitted by the committee, as the case may be, yet it is better to use them as heretofore stated. If only one term is used, the word 'adopt' is preferable, as it is least liable to be misunderstood."

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Need for a Faculty Code of Conduct:

Findings and Recommendations

In carrying out its charge to study and determine the need for a Faculty Code of Conduct, the Committee was necessarily engaged in speculation upon ends or consequences in a probable future; but conducted its investigation primarily by a consideration of causes or pressures, both external and internal.

Of external factors, the most compelling would be legislative action, perhaps reflecting public sentiment. But despite rumors, publicity, and the introduction of several bills, the Committee found no evidence that repressive legislation would be enacted--nor would it recommend that we act out of anticipation or fear of such legislation.

A second external pressure would be the trend in higher education. Stanford, Illinois State, the Oregon system, Wisconsin State, and other schools have indeed adopted codes or procedures of some sort; but the trend does not seem to be gaining momentum nation-wide. And within the State of Washington, the University's Code offers only broad provisions on matters that seem generally subject to civil or criminal action; the well publicized WSU Code had not actually been promulgated at the time of this writing; nor had the other state colleges taken any action. From a comparative point of view, then, the Committee found no real pressure for enactment of a code of conduct--nor would it recommend "bandwagon" action, in any event.

A final external factor would be the sentiment of the profession itself, as manifested in proposals and policies of the various organizations. For instance, within the past year the WEA offered a bill of particulars as a response to possible repressive legislation; the American Association of State Colleges and Universities endorsed a mild statement on "Academic Responsibility"; and the AAUP adopted a policy statement on "Freedom and Responsibility" addressed directly to the issue of faculty self-discipline. But the Committee feels that these actions are sufficient in themselves, as general guidelines and reflections of traditional professional sentiment; and do not necessitate local adoption of a Code.

As for internal pressures, the Committee found little or no evidence that there was felt need or desire for a code of conduct on this campus. Members of the Administration denied that they knew of cases requiring such a code or that they had heard expressions of support for adoption of one; and certainly the members of the Committee found little or no favorable sentiment in their various departments. The Committee did not formally poll the faculty, but did not feel that polling was necessary or desirable. In this case, the absence of evidence seems meaningful and sufficient.

The Committee therefore finds no need for a code of conduct--but does not thereby admit to or condone irresponsibility or license on the part of the faculty. It should be clearly recognized that faculty conduct is in fact already governed by a strong sense of self-discipline, apparent in both the history of and current situation at this college, and by existing policies and procedures.

Pertinent policies now in effect were collected and distributed by President Brooks during the Spring Moratorium considerations of 1969: The Faculty Code prohibits the introduction of controversial matter not related to the class subject; and demands accuracy, appropriate restraint, and care not to act as an institutional spokesman. The Faculty Handbook sets forth detailed requirements on such matters as holding classes, giving assigned final exams, and honoring office hours.

The revision of the Code now ready for presentation to the Faculty and Board of Trustees, furthermore, provides for an elaborate grievance procedure through which the administration, as well as the faculty, can bring charges, reconcile differences, and seek redress.

The Committee feels that these provisions, coupled with the traditional sense of professional responsibility and the final possibility of recourse to law, are sufficient; and therefore recommends that no further action be taken toward promulgation of a Faculty Code of Conduct.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry L. Lawrence
Edward P. Klucking
Keith Rinehart
James G. Nylander
Douglas Sprague

----- C - O - P - Y -----

TO: The Faculty Senate
Gordon Leavitt, Chairman

FROM: Louise Tobin, Co-chairman Home Economics Personnel Committee

DATE: October 28, 1971

RE: Clarification of Faculty Code

Decisions on a number of issues within departments will soon be affected by voting of their members. Voting privileges may be unclear in some departments where a variety of employment conditions exist. Is the Faculty Code to be followed in all instances in departmental voting?

/s/ Louise Tobin

Dear Colleague:

I hope you can take the time to attend our conference. We've arranged to have an unused dorm opened at EWSC specially for this workshop. This will allow cost savings so you'll have no expense other than transportation, *if you pre-register*. We're planning on having up to 100 participants from the colleges and universities listed on this pamphlet.

NEA/AHE members of our chapters at EWSC, Spokane Falls Community College, and Spokane Community College will be on hand to transport you from Spokane International Airport to the dorm. Parking is noted on the enclosed map, if you drive. Your dinner Friday, breakfast Saturday, and lunch Saturday are at no cost to you.

I'm looking forward to meeting you on November 5.

Mrs. Pat Keller
President
Association for Higher
Education—WEA

Colleges and Universities Invited:

Alaska

University of Alaska
Alaska Methodist University
Anchorage Community College
Juneau Community College
Kenai Peninsula Community College
Ketchikan Community College
Matanuska—Susitna Community College
Sitka Community College
Sheldon Jackson Junior College

Idaho

Boise State College
Idaho State University
Lewis and Clark Normal School
University of Idaho
College of Idaho
Northwest Nazarene College
Boise Junior College
College of Southern Idaho
Northern Idaho Junior College
College of St. Gertrude
Rick's College

Montana

Eastern Montana College
Montana College of Mineral Science
Montana State University
Northern Montana College
University of Montana
Western Montana College
Carroll College
College of Great Falls
Rocky Mountain College
Dawson Community College
Miles Community College
Flathead Valley Community College

Oregon

Eastern Oregon College
Oregon College of Education
Oregon State University
Portland State University
Southern Oregon College
University of Oregon
George Fox College
Lewis and Clark College
Linfield College
Marylhurst College
Mt. Angel College
Northwest Christian College
Pacific University
Reed College
University of Portland

Warner Pacific College
Willamette University
Blue Mountain Community College
Central Oregon Community College
Clackamas Community College
Clatsop Community College
Lane Community College
Linn Benton Community College
Mt. Hood Community College
Portland Community College
Salem Tech-Voc Community College
Treasure Valley Community College
Umpqua Community College
Concordia College

Washington

University of Washington
Washington State University
Central Washington State College
Eastern Washington State College
The Evergreen State College
Western Washington State College
Bellevue Community College
Big Bend Community College
Centralia College
Clark College
Columbia Basin College
Edmonds Community College
Everett Community College
Fort Steilacoom Community College
Grays Harbor College
Green River Community College
Highline Community College
Lower Columbia College
Olympic College
Peninsula College
Seattle Central Community College
North Seattle Community College
South Seattle Community College
Skagit Valley College
Spokane Community College
Spokane Falls Community College
Tacoma Community College
Walla Walla Community College
Wenatchee Valley College
Fort Wright College
Gonzaga University
Pacific Lutheran University
St. Martin's College
Seattle Pacific College
Seattle University
University of Puget Sound
Walla Walla College
Whitman College
Whitworth College
Shoreline Community College
Yakima Valley College

REGIONAL CONFERENCE ON NEGOTIATIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Sponsored by
THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
Hosted by
WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION
FOR HIGHER EDUCATION



NOVEMBER 5-6, 1971

EASTERN WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE
CHENEY, WASHINGTON

SUTTON HALL

PURPOSE OF THE CONFERENCE:

NEA/AHE is cooperating on this five-state workshop centered around negotiations because we feel higher education faculties are and will be needing more and more expertise in this subject as the 1970's progress.

Washington's community colleges are operating under a negotiations law. The conference will be a means of giving teams from each of these colleges more of the tools they need to do an effective job at the negotiations table. Our four-year colleges and universities are on the move, both in acquiring members and in seeking bargaining on the campuses.

We feel the faculties of colleges and universities in Alaska, Idaho, Montana, and Oregon will want to participate in this conference and bring themselves up to date in an area of college life that is bound to affect them in the near future.

YOUR SCHEDULE:

1. Arrive Friday noon, 11/5
2. Session, 1-5 p.m.
3. Social hour and dinner, 6-9
4. Breakfast, 7:30-8:30, 11/6
5. Session, 9-Noon
6. Lunch, Noon-1:00
7. Session, 1:30-4:30

SCOPE OF THE PROGRAM:

Negotiations and the Law

Why Negotiate?

Proposal Development

Job Security

Fact Finding, Mediation, Arbitration

Impasses

Selection of Local Negotiators

CONFERENCE LEADERS:

Dave Graham, NEA Higher Education
Negotiations Staff

Bill Shreeve, AHE State PN Chairman

Bob Granger, Local Association President,
State University of New York

George Green, NEA Northwest Regional
Director

Bob Hipps, NEA Northwest PN Consultant

CONFERENCE COORDINATORS:

Mrs. Pat Keller, AHE State President

Wayne Hall, Program Director for Higher
Education, Washington Education
Association

Members of AHE STATE PN Committee

REGISTRATION FORM - NEA PN CONFERENCE

Name: _____

Title: _____

School: _____

Address: _____

Mail form to: _____

Mrs. Pat Keller
E. 3403 Mission Avenue
Spokane, Wa 99202

Name: _____

Title: _____

School: _____

Address: _____

Need transportation to and from airport: _____

Arrival: _____

COUNCIL OF FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES

RECOMMENDATIONS TO

THE COUNCIL OF PRESIDENTS

ONE

The Council of Faculty Representatives urges the Council of Presidents to initiate immediate action to offset the serious consequences of the marked decline in relative compensation of the Washington state universities and colleges.

As first priority, they should consider the serious deterioration of the economic status, and the declining morale, of the faculty members in the past several years.

The Council further urges that the Presidents' major thrust in the next three years, by personally exerting every influence possible on the public, on the legislature, and on their respective governing boards, be to reverse the drastic decline in relative compensation in order to maintain a high quality of faculty.

TWO

In order to make the state institutions of higher education minimally competitive with others of a similar nature, the Council of Faculty Representatives requests the Council of Presidents to seek an emergency appropriation from the 1972 special session of the Washington state legislature for the following increases in total faculty compensation for the 1972-73 academic year:

1. For state universities--20-25% above the 1971-72 level;
2. For state colleges-----15-20% above the 1971-72 level.

The Council of Faculty Representatives further urges the Council of Presidents to request from the 1973 regular session of the Washington state legislature for all state universities and colleges the following additional increases in total faculty compensation:

1. At least 20% above the proposed 1972-73 level;

plus

2. An amount equal to the increase in the cost of living.

These increases are necessary to achieve parity with persons of similar or less training, education, and experience employed in other sectors of the society.

THREE

The Council of Faculty Representatives recommends that the Council of Presidents request emergency legislation and any necessary appropriation for funds sufficient to bring the standards of retirement for faculty members of four-year colleges and universities to the point where the minimum income of a retired faculty member is no less than fifty percent of his average annual salary for the highest two consecutive years of service. This income is to be supplemental to, and in no way connected with, the amounts paid to the retiree under the provisions of the federal social security law, and is to be modified, when necessary, by annual post-retirement changes geared to the cost of living, provided that in no case shall the retirement payments ever be lower than the initial level at retirement.

RECOMMENDATION ONE.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Economic Status of the Council of Faculty Representatives recommends that the Council of Presidents be urged to initiate immediate action to offset the serious consequences of the marked decline in relative compensation of the faculties of the universities and colleges of the state of Washington. As first priority, therefore, they should consider the serious nature of the deterioration of the economic status, and the declining morale, of the faculty members in the last several years. They should show their positive concern for these matters, first, by pursuing the goal of excellence in higher education in this state by personally exerting every positive influence possible on the public, on the legislature, and on their boards of trustees or boards of regents; second, by personally taking a stand in any matters of concern to the economic well-being of their faculties in order that it will be unequivocally interpreted by the Governor, the legislature, and other regulatory agencies, and, most importantly, by their respective faculties, to mean that their major thrust in the next three years will be to reverse the drastic decline in relative faculty compensation in order to re-establish a high quality of faculty; and third, by aggressively acting in such a way that their faculties easily recognize that these important matters have indeed been given the highest priority.

RECOMMENDATION TWO

The Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Economic Status of the Council of Faculty Representatives recommends that the Council of Faculty Representatives request that an emergency appropriation be sought by the Council of Presidents from the 1972 Special Session of the Washington State Legislature for salary and fringe benefit increases for the 1972-73 academic year for faculty members of the Washington state universities equal to twenty to twenty-five percent of the 1971-72 academic year levels in order to make the state universities competitive with others of a similar nature, and for salary and fringe benefit increases for the 1972-73 academic year for faculty members of the Washington state colleges equal to fifteen to twenty percent of the 1971-72 academic year levels in order to make the state colleges competitive with others of a similar nature. The committee further recommends that an additional request be made to the 1973 Regular Session of the Washington State Legislature for at least an additional ten percent increase in total compensation above the 1972-73 levels, plus a percentage increase equal to the cost of living increase for the 1972-73 academic year, in order to achieve a partial reduction of the vast differences that exist between faculty compensations at the Washington state colleges and universities and those compensations available to persons of similar or less training, education, and experience employed by other sectors of the society.

RECOMMENDATION THREE

The Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Economic Status of the Council of Faculty Representatives recommends that the Council of Faculty Representatives request that emergency legislation and any necessary appropriation be sought by the Council of Presidents for funds sufficient to bring the standards of retirement for faculty members of four-year colleges and universities to the point where the minimum income of a retired faculty member is no less than fifty percent of his average annual salary for the highest two consecutive years of service. This income is to be supplemental to, and in no way connected with, those contributions paid to the retired under the provisions of the federal social security law, and is to be modified, when necessary, by annual post-retirement changes geared to the cost of living, provided that in no case shall the retirement payments ever be lower than the initial level at retirement.

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Faculty Senate Members

FROM: V. Gerald Reed, Chairman
Senate Curriculum Committee

DATE: October 29, 1971

RE: 1. ACCC proposals, pp. 195-197
2. Policy statements regarding the 90 credit transfer limitation from Community Colleges and establishment of Field Experience and Intern type programs.

1. The Senate Curriculum Committee voted to recommend passage of ACCC proposals, pages 195-197 without changes.
2. The SCC considered various aspects of the 90 credit transfer limitation for Junior College transfer students and the need for guidelines for the developing Field Experience programs but withheld action until additional information and discussion has been presented. These issues will be reconsidered at the next SCC meeting on 4 November.

PREAMBLE

In submitting a request for a supplemental budget for the 1971-72 fiscal year, our most urgent and highest priority need is for improvement of the salary structure for the faculty and staff in our institution. For many years we have compared the salaries paid to our faculty with salaries paid to faculty in similar institutions in seven other states. Although in 1961 our salary scales were at a parity with the average salaries of the institutions in these seven comparable states, since that time, our relative position has deteriorated so that in the fall of 1970, we were at approximately 95% of the average of the comparison institutions. Information from these several states indicates that our inability to provide salary increases in July of 1971 for the 1971-72 year will place our average salaries at approximately 90% of the average salaries of the comparison institutions. Failure to provide for salary increases for the 1972-73 academic year will result in further deterioration in our relative salary position to approximately 85% of parity.

Such deterioration will inevitably lead to disastrous consequences for our institution in its ability not only to recruit new faculty, but more importantly, to retain many of our present faculty in the national markets in which we must compete. Loss of such faculty with an inability to replace them with equal quality faculty, can only reduce seriously, the quality of higher education in this state.

During the period from July 1, 1970 to July 1972, the "cost of living" in this region will, in all probability, have risen by at least 7%. Failure, therefore, to provide during this period for any salary adjustment will mean an actual reduction in the purchasing power of faculty salaries by this amount, and, in effect, a "real" reduction in salaries.

In the absence of salary adjustment, salaries for staff, which have been compared to prevailing market rates in this area, will also deteriorate during this two year period, both relative to the increase in the "cost of living" and to competitive scales being paid in the private market.

We are, therefore, requesting supplemental appropriations sufficient to provide for a 10% increase in the average salaries for faculty. The 10% increase for faculty would provide a 7% increase necessary to offset the increase in "cost of living", thus preventing absolute declines in real income of the faculty and will allow for a modest 3% increment to prevent further deterioration in our relative position compared with our comparison institutions. Such an increase, in fact, would leave the faculty no better off in the fall of 1972, relative to our national competition, than in the fall of 1970. We will, in effect, have stood still in faculty salaries over this biennium if this 10% were received. While we regard this increase as a single step in a phased program to recover a parity position with comparable institutions, we believe this request gives due consideration to and

reflects our concern over the current plight of the state's economy and of the resultant fiscal problems of state government.

We are also requesting supplemental appropriation sufficient to provide a 7% increase in the salary scales for staff. The requested increase for staff employees will prevent an absolute deterioration in their real income, but may not prevent some loss of relative position to comparable occupational scales in this local area, but not as extreme as for faculty.

Faculty in our institutions are keenly aware of the deterioration in their relative salary positions, both with respect to the "cost of living" and the national market. Representatives of faculty from all four-year institutions have met with interinstitutional academic officers and the Council of Presidents to present data regarding their relative positions and to request our consideration of salary adjustments to correct these inequities. Indeed, their data show that faculty salaries, when compared with all institutions surveyed by AAUP indicate that we are as much as 15-20% behind the comparable categories of institutions. Failure to heed in any way requests from the inter-institutional faculty committee will be certain to lead to loss of confidence in the present system of salary discussions.

for and paid expense